

BUDGET, FINANCE & INVESTMENT COMMITTEE

May 15, 2012

5:30 P.M.

Courthouse

MINUTES:

Members Present:

Comm. Charlie Baum
Comm. Joe Frank Jernigan
Comm. Will Jordan
Comm. Robert Peay, Jr.
Comm. Steve Sandlin
Comm. Doug Shafer
Comm. Joyce Ealy, Chrm.

Others Present:

Ernest Burgess
Heather Dawbarn
Bill Boner
Teb Batey
Lisa Duke Crowell
Nicole Lester
Ransom Jones

Others Present:

Jim Cope
John Bratcher
Laura Bohling
Lisa Nolen
Michael Payne
Sonya Stephenson
Doug Demosi

Others Present:

Delwyn Corbitt
Ben Mankin
John Lodl
Melissa Stinson
David Jones
Jeff Sandvig
Scott Broden
Elaine Short

Chairman Ealy presided and called the meeting to order with all members being present.

2012-2013 BUDGET REVIEW:

The purpose of the meeting was to begin reviewing the 2012-13 budget beginning with departments in the General Fund.

Chairman Ealy noted that the 2012-13 budget overview was presented at the regular Budget Committee meeting on May 10, 2012 and was the result of many weeks of work by the County Mayor, the Finance Director, and the department heads. She reminded the committee that Mayor Burgess advised that he believed that the budget for the General Fund could work without a property tax increase.

Chairman Ealy appealed to the committee to honor the work done by the County Mayor, the Finance Director and the department heads and to focus on staying within the parameters of the mayor's recommendation.

Chairman Ealy advised as each departmental budget was reviewed, the department head would be invited to join the committee at the table. Mayor Burgess would then present his recommendation. The Department head would have an opportunity to speak to any details about their specific budget and to affirm as to whether or not they agreed or disagreed with the mayor's recommendation. The committee was given an opportunity to ask questions and to discuss each budget. To facilitate the process, a voice vote would be taken on each budget unless a roll call vote was requested.

COMMUNITY LEARNING:

Dr. Michael Payne, Community Learning Center Director, was present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 Community Learning budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$241,292. Mayor Burgess advised that the budget was a continuation budget, and that the increase was attributed to the normal pay increases.

Dr. Payne advised that he agreed with the mayor's recommendation, and that the budget was the same as the previous year except for the pay increases for the employees.

Comm. Jernigan moved, seconded by Comm. Sandlin to approve the 2012-13 Community Learning budget as recommended by the County Mayor totaling \$241,292.

Comm. Peay asked if the pay increases reflected in the budget included the new pay plan as presented during the budget overview on May 10.

Mayor Burgess advised that every employee had been re-valued, and that some employees would receive the same pay and others would receive more. He stated that as to the Community Learning Center, the employees' pay increases were essentially routine increases.

Comm. Peay asked Mayor Burgess to confirm that the new pay plan could be put into place without a property tax increase.

Mayor Burgess advised that in the County General Fund, the revenues, with the use of some fund balance, were enough to support the total recommended budget including the pay increases for employees.

Comm. Peay asked if that also included the School Board's requested budget.

The Finance Director advised that the County Mayor did not make a recommendation on the School Board's budget.

Mayor Burgess stated that the School Board's budget was independent.

Comm. Jordan stated that it might be necessary to move some pennies on the property tax rate to the School Board's budget.

Mayor Burgess stated that the School Board employees received automatic pay raises according to their salary table every year.

Comm. Shafer questioned the Employee and Dependent Insurance Account for Community Learning and if the recommended amount of \$13,980 included the new rates that would begin January 1, 2013.

The Finance Director advised that the Employee and Dependent Insurance Accounts for every department had been estimated, keeping in mind that option one was being eliminated and the co-pay option was being added.

Comm. Baum stated that the committee would be approving the department budgets of the General Fund now assuming that they would be able to find a solution to the School Board's budget to avoid a property tax increase. He stated that if that did not happen, the Budget Committee might want to go back and look at the salary increases in the General Fund. He stated that the committee was willing to consider the salary increases based upon the assumption that School Board's portion of the budget could be balanced. If the School Board's portion of the budget could not be balanced, the committee would have the option to reduce the pay increases by a certain amount or maybe altogether.

The Finance Director stated that the committee would have other opportunities to review the General Fund budget. She explained that the next several meetings were giving the department heads the opportunity to come before the committee.

Comm. Jernigan stated that the School Board's budget would be totally separate from the General Fund budget.

Comm. Shafer stated that any budget could be changed up until the time that the property tax levy was set, even on the commission floor if necessary.

The Finance Director stated that the committee would be making decisions before the Public Hearing, and after the Public Hearing, the committee would still be making decisions. She stated that there would be several opportunities for the committee to review any budget.

Following discussion, the motion to approve the 2012-13 Community Learning budget as recommended by the County Mayor totaling \$241,292 passed unanimously by acclamation.

Comm. Sandlin asked the total cost of the pay plan that had been included in the budget.

Mayor Burgess stated that the total cost of the pay plan that had been included in the General Fund budget was \$1.6 million.

Comm. Sandlin asked what the normal cost of the pay plan would be for the General Fund if the new plan was not included.

Mayor Burgess advised that the cost would be approximately \$372,000.

Comm. Jordan asked if either quote included benefits.

Mayor Burgess advised that it did not include benefits.

Comm. Sandlin asked what the cost of the pay plan would be in year two.

The Finance Director stated that if nothing else was done, and employees only moved one step, it would cost approximately 1.75%.

Comm. Sandlin asked if the new pay plan was something that needed to be added on a department by department basis, or if it was something that needed to be discussed at the end of the budgetary process. He stated that it would almost be misleading the employees if the budgets for each department were approved, and then at the end the pay increases had to be removed because the money for the pay increases was not available due to the committee adding something or because of the School Board's budget.

Comm. Baum stated that he believed that there was a chance that might happen.

The Finance Director stated that she would think that whatever the committee decided that it would be consistently applied across every department.

Comm. Jordan stated that everyone needed to realize that the pay plan was still in play. He stated that the Finance Department needed to be prepared at some point to present documents with and without the pay plan. He stated that the committee would have to look at the property tax rate as a whole.

Comm. Baum stated that it might have been helpful to review the School Board's budget first. He stated that he understood that even if the budget was reviewed in that order, there would be uncertainty until the very end.

Comm. Jernigan again stated that the School Board's budget was separate. He stated that the School Board's budget did not have anything to do with the General Fund budget. Comm. Jernigan stated that the School Board might have to find cuts in their budget.

Comm. Jordan stated that if the School Board needed more money on the property tax rate, property tax might have to be taken from another department.

Chairman Ealy advised that the first phase of the pay plan had already been included in the mayor's recommendation.

Mayor Burgess stated that if the committee chose not to approve the pay increases after they completed their review of the budget, the pay raises would be uniformly and consistently removed from every department.

Comm. Sandlin stated that the pay increases amounted to four times more than what the normal pay increase would have been, and that was a little powerful. He asked if the pay increases were consistent or if there were some employees who would be receiving large increases.

The Finance Director stated that the pay increases ran the gamut. She stated that some employees' pay increases were capped at \$5,000, because there were some employees who would have received more than that based on the new evaluations. Some employees would receive no pay increase, because they were where they should be on the pay table. She stated that with 1,000 employees, there were 1,000 different situations.

REGISTER OF DEEDS:

Mrs. Heather Dawbarn, Register of Deeds, was present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 Register of Deeds budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$1,101,139, which was an increase of \$71,800. He explained that the budget included one new position for a Records Manager, and equipment for the Records Manager to begin the process of scanning documents for other departments.

Mrs. Dawbarn advised that she had negotiated with Progress, who was the data processing services vendor, and that line item 101-51600-317, Data Processing Services, could be reduced to \$36,970. Mrs. Dawbarn advised that line items 51600-317, Data Processing Services, 51600-334, Maintenance Agreements, 51600-411, Data Processing Supplies, and 51600-709, Data Processing Equipment, were funded from the Register of Deeds Data Processing Fees, which were restricted for data processing related expenditures.

Mrs. Dawbarn advised that recently, the duties of the Register of Deeds Office had been expanded to include records management for the county, and her office would be scanning and microfilming for other offices throughout the county. She stated that she hoped that this would create savings for other offices next year. These new duties were only recently approved by the legislature, and she would have to amend the budget in order to purchase microfilm equipment and scanners. She explained line item 51600-399, Other Contracted Services, budgeted at \$13,000, provided funding to pay for the microfilming services. After the microfilming equipment is received, this account can be removed from the budget.

Mrs. Dawbarn explained as to the new position in the budget, a full time position was eliminated last year. As to the pay increases, she has determined that the Register's Office would remain with the normal step increase and would not be participating in the new pay plan.

Comm. Baum asked Mrs. Dawbarn what her rationale was for not accepting the salary increases.

Mrs. Dawbarn responded by stating that the new salary increases created some unintended consequences such as creating additional stress on the Tennessee Consolidated Retirement System. She stated that she did not believe that a fair comparison was done when looking at benefits and salaries from county to county. She also stated that her office recorded all foreclosures, and that people were struggling. She stated that she struggled with government receiving pay increases when the outside market was not necessarily receiving those types of pay increases. She stated that she did not have a retention problem in her office.

Comm. Shafer asked if there was an employee who could perform the records manager duties instead of creating a new position.

Mrs. Dawbarn stated that she would be creating significant duties. She advised that the records manager would not only be performing records management for her office, but for other offices throughout the county. She stated that she had to add records management to the duties of the Register through legislation.

The Finance Director advised that the revised total for the 2012-13 Register of Deed's budget was \$1,058,109.

Following discussion, Comm. Sandlin moved, seconded by Comm. Jordan to approve the 2012-13 Register of Deed's budget as revised totaling \$1,058,109.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

COUNTY COMMISSION:

The mayor's recommendation for the 2012-13 County Commission budget totaled \$245,157.

Comm. Sandlin moved, seconded by Comm. Peay to approve the 2012-13 County Commission budget as recommended by the County Mayor totaling \$245,157.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION:

The mayor's recommendation for the 2012-13 Board of Equalization budget totaled \$23,270.

Comm. Sandlin moved, seconded by Comm. Jernigan to approve the 2012-13 Board of Equalization budget totaling \$23,270 as recommended by the County Mayor.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

PROPERTY ASSESSOR:

The mayor's recommendation for the 2012-13 Property Assessor budget totaled \$1,877,454. Mayor Burgess advised line item 52300-106, Deputies, included one eliminated position, and the remainder of the account included the pay increases as a result of the new valuations. Mayor Burgess pointed out other increases and/or decreases to the budget.

The Finance Director advised that the budget funded 24 positions.

Following review, Comm. Peay moved, seconded by Comm. Jernigan to approve the 2012-13 Property Assessor budget totaling \$1,877,454 as recommended by the County Mayor.

The motion passed by voice vote with Comm. Shafer abstaining.

REAPPRAISAL:

The mayor's recommendation for the 2012-13 Reappraisal budget totaled \$531,933.

Mayor Burgess advised that account 52310-106, Deputies, included one eliminated position with the remaining positions being re-valued. He explained other changes to the budget.

The Finance Director advised that the budget funded nine positions.

Comm. Jernigan moved, seconded by Comm. Sandlin to approve the 2012-13 Reappraisal budget as recommended by the County Mayor totaling \$531,933.

The motion passed by voice vote with Comm. Shafer abstaining.

COUNTY MAYOR:

Mayor Burgess advised that the 2012-13 County Mayor budget totaled \$440,986. He pointed out that Account 51300-330, Operating Lease Payments, budgeted at \$7,560 provided funding for two postage machines.

Comm. Jernigan moved, seconded by Comm. Peay to approve the 2012-13 County Mayor budget totaling \$440,986 as recommended.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

HUMAN RESOURCE:

Mrs. Sonya Stephenson, Human Resource Director, was present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 Human Resource budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$286,690.

Mayor Burgess noted that the position in line item 51310-189, Other Salaries and Wages, was being moved to Account 101-51310-103, Assistants, which increased the budgeted amount from \$43,637 to \$73,810.

Mrs. Stephenson advised that she accepted the mayor's recommendation.

Comm. Peay moved, seconded by Comm. Jordan to approve the mayor's recommendation for the 2012-13 Human Resource budget totaling \$286,690.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

Comm. Peay asked Mrs. Stephenson what other information she had regarding the salary study.

Mrs. Stephenson advised that in comparing Rutherford County with what was going on elsewhere, there were three sectors -- those who were self-employed, those who were employed in the private sector, and those who were employed in the public sector. She stated that she belonged to an organization called the Society of Human Resource Management (SHRM). She explained that the people who belong to the organization perform salary surveys, and that she had contacted every member of the Rutherford County group and had received several responses. She stated that everyone who responded advised that salary increases were being given with the range being between two percent and three percent. She stated that they were not huge increases, and Rutherford County was considering 1.75%. She stated that there might be some industries that were not giving pay increases, but the people who responded to her were giving pay increases.

Comm. Shafer stated that he had asked both of his children about pay increases in the private sector, and both of them said that they were giving pay increases and that they also had bonus plans.

COUNTY ATTORNEY:

Mr. Jim Cope, County Attorney, was present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 County Attorney budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$338,560.

Mayor Burgess advised that the requested budget totaling \$438,230 was overstated by approximately \$47,000. He explained that the savings between the recommended budget and the requested budget were closer to \$60,000 to \$80,000 instead of \$100,000. He explained that Account 101-51400-331, Legal Services, previously included approximately \$225,000 for routine services, as well as approximately \$25,000 for miscellaneous legal assistance largely for PAWS.

Mayor Burgess advised that in Account 101-51400-101, County Official/Administrative, he was recommending \$120,000 for an in-house county attorney. Account 51400-161, Secretary, recommended at \$67,840 included funding for a legal secretary and one administrative assistant.

Comm. Baum asked to what extent was it expected that one in-house attorney would be able to provide the legal services that the county needed without needing additional assistance.

Mayor Burgess advised that the recommendation was for routine services only. He stated that this had nothing to do with litigation.

Comm. Baum stated he was referring to routine services, and there might be different areas of law that an in-house attorney might not be familiar with and might need assistance with routine services.

Mayor Burgess advised that the County Attorney had billed the county approximately 1,250 hours on an amortized basis costing approximately \$225,000. He stated that it appeared that there would be enough hours in a full time position to perform the work that the county attorney had charged the county for.

Comm. Baum stated that would take care of the time needed, but what if the in-house attorney was strong in tax law and bankruptcy law, but was not as strong in employment law and needed reinforcements time-wise or for expertise dealing with an issue that he/or she was not an expert in.

Mayor Burgess stated that one person might not ever know what two or more people might know.

Comm. Baum stated that he was comfortable with the years of experience that the Cope law firm had, and the fact that they had six or seven attorneys with expertise in different areas. He stated that was reassuring. One of the concerns he had was on the cost side. He stated that it was his understanding that a few years ago there was a flat fee that was budgeted in Account 101-51400-101, County Official/Administrative, and that there was not additional charges for additional billable hours. He stated in the 2009-10 budget, the total cost for the County Attorney was \$259,000. He asked if there was a possibility of keeping the experience and the expertise of the Cope law firm and at the same time save money by going back to the old arrangement that was in place in the 2009-2010 budget.

Mayor Burgess stated that there was always an option to do anything that all parties agree to. He stated that he agreed that the Cope firm had given the county exceptional, professional, quality, competent service. He stated that there was no question about that in the minds of anybody. He explained that the way the County Attorney budget was currently structured, the \$72,000 budgeted in Account 101-51400-101 was a retainer. He stated that the county had paid everything based upon an hourly rate.

Comm. Jordan stated that he remembered when the two-year contract was approved, but he was not completely sure or did not understand. He thought that at the end of two years, the commission would discuss what to do about legal services in the future. He stated that he liked the security of having several attorneys assisting the county. He stated that when he first became a commissioner, the county did not have a HR Department. He stated that the first HR Director that was hired was placed in a small area with no staff, and now there was a HR Department. He stated that he worried about starting another department. He asked where the attorney and the staff would be located.

Mayor Burgess advised that there was some space in a building that was not being used.

Comm. Peay stated that there were times that the county has had to hire outside attorneys either due to a conflict, or the county attorney might not have had the time to represent the county on certain cases. He stated that had been done all along.

Mr. Cope advised that the contract would end in less than six weeks.

Mayor Burgess advised that there were two more years left on the contract for litigation.

Comm. Sandlin asked if the in-house attorney would also represent the School Board.

Mayor Burgess advised that the School Board employed their own attorney.

Comm. Baum asked if it would be complicated or awkward if the new in-house attorney handled the routine legal services, and the litigation would continue to be handled by the Cope firm. He asked if the contracts should expire at the same time.

Comm. Jernigan stated that he was concerned about getting into the attorney business. He stated that the Cope firm had done an outstanding job, and he would not be voting for it. He did not believe it was the right thing to do. He stated that he did not believe one attorney could handle everything that Rutherford County needed.

Comm. Baum asked if it would make sense to give the Cope firm an opportunity to submit another proposal that would be designed to reduce costs.

Mayor Burgess advised that his recommendation would take care of routine services and delinquent property tax collection.

Following discussion, Comm. Peay moved, seconded by Comm. Sandlin to approve the 2012-13 County Attorney budget as recommended by the County Mayor totaling \$338,560.

Comm. Baum requested that a roll call vote be taken.

Comm. Jordan asked if the Legal Services Agreement could be brought up under other business at the County Commission meeting to be discussed further. He stated that this was a huge change.

Comm. Sandlin stated that the Legal Services Agreement was on the Steering Committee agenda, and he was surprised that Mr. Cope was not there. He stated that Mayor Burgess had done his job as far as what was in place and what was suppose to happen. He stated that legal services for the county had been discussed for a long time. He stated that he believed the county would be able to handle the routine services and the delinquent tax collections with an in-house attorney.

Mr. Cope stated that the law firm and himself individually would be happy to do whatever the County Commission would like for them to do. He stated that if the county wanted the law firm to continue working with them on some basis, they would be happy to talk about that. If the county wanted to go in a different direction, he understood. He stated that the reason that he was not at the Steering Committee was because he was not invited. He stated that the contract had been in place for almost two years, and he thought that if there was some issue regarding it or a counter-proposal that needed to be addressed he would be invited to discuss it. He stated that he enjoyed working with the mayor, and he enjoyed working with all of the department heads. He stated that it was a privilege and an honor to do that. He stated that the law firm offered good experience and expertise. He stated that if the County Commission would like for him to submit a proposal for their consideration, he would be happy to do that.

Comm. Peay stated that all 21 commissioners had voted on the Legal Services Agreement, and he stated that was what the recommended budget was about. He stated that he felt good that there was another two years on the Agreement for litigation.

Mayor Burgess noted that the fees paid to the County Attorney for back tax collections exceeded \$150,000 per year.

Mr. Cope explained that the people paid those fees when the penalty and interest was paid and they were not paid from county funds. He stated that last year over \$3 million was collected by the law firm for back tax work, and 450 back tax suits were filed. He asked the committee if they believed one attorney could file 450 suits in addition to performing the necessary legal services for the county.

Comm. Sandlin stated that the budget that was being proposed was carrying out what the County Commission had voted to do.

Comm. Jordan asked if there was a way that the Legal Services Agreement could be discussed at the County Commission on Thursday night and a vote taken to see if the full commission was in favor of proceeding with the Legal Services Agreement.

Mayor Burgess stated that he would take responsibility for assuming that the County Commission made the decision regarding the Legal Services Agreement two years ago.

Following discussion, the motion to approve the 2012-13 County Attorney budget as recommended by the County Mayor totaling \$338,560 passed by roll call vote with Commissioners Peay, Sandlin, Shafer, and Ealy voting "yes"; and Commissioners Baum, Jernigan, and Jordan voting "no".

Comm. Jordan stated that he would hope that someone would bring up the Legal Services Agreement on the commission floor.

Comm. Peay requested that Mayor Burgess add the Legal Services Agreement to the County Commission agenda under other business.

Mayor Burgess advised that the agenda had been released, but he could release a revised agenda.

ELECTION COMMISSION:

Ms. Nicole Lester, Administrator of Elections, and Mr. Ransom Jones, Election Commission Chairman, were present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 Election budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$948,099.

Mayor Burgess explained his recommendation compared to the request noting that Account 51500-193, Election Workers, was requested at \$285,000, but he was recommending \$200,000. Account 51500-196, In-Service Training, was reduced from \$9,900 to \$4,000. Account 51500-307, Communications, was reduced from \$13,000 to \$9,000. Account 51500-351, Rentals, budgeted at \$142,974 reflected renting 146 MicroVote Infinity Voting Machines, which would be offset by grant money.

Ms. Lester explained that the reason for requesting a larger amount was due to the state senate lines, which could potentially require an additional nineteen precincts. She stated that some election equipment could only be ordered from two or three supply companies. If Rutherford County were required to add nineteen precincts, there would be a lot of supplies that would be needed, as well as additional poll workers to staff the additional sites.

Ms. Lester advised that the Steering Committee voted unanimously to recommend to the County Commission tweaking the county commission district lines to line up with the state senate lines, which would reduce the costs. If the County Commission approved the recommendation from the Steering Committee, the additional funds would not be necessary.

Ms. Lester explained that Account 51500-192, Election Commission, requested at \$17,500 provided funding for the five election commissioners and included money for the commissioners to attend seminars provided by the statewide organization, which will be held in Memphis. The mayor's recommendation was \$13,000. She advised that everything they do in the office was based directly on state, local and federal laws, and the staff and the Election Commission must remain up-to-date on all of the laws.

Ms. Lester advised that when the budget was prepared she did not know how many polling sites were going to be required. The amount requested for Account 51500-193, Election Workers, was \$285,000, and the mayor's recommendation was \$200,000. She advised that she has since done an analysis on the poll workers, and was revising the request to \$230,850 including FICA and Medicare for Early Voting Workers and Overtime.

Ms. Lester explained that she had requested \$9,900 in Account 51500-196, In-Service Training, so that the office staff could attend the summer seminar in June, 2013. She stated that it had been several years since the staff had been able to attend the training. The mayor's recommendation was \$4,000.

Ms. Lester advised that she had an additional request. She explained that she was requesting an additional \$10,000 to purchase shelving that was needed at the warehouse for storing precinct signs and other equipment. She advised that she was not planning to purchase new shelving, and was hoping to find used shelving from a consignment company.

The Finance Director advised that as to the request for \$230,850 for poll workers, the amount of \$3,000 for overtime was budgeted in Account 51500-187, Overtime Pay. The amount requested for FICA and Medicare was budgeted in Accounts 51500-201, Social Security, and 51500-212,

Medicare. When taking those amounts out, there was only a difference of \$10,000 from the request and the mayor's recommendation.

Mayor Burgess requested that the committee consider his recommendation of \$948,099.

Ms. Lester stated that she would try to work with the mayor's recommendation.

Following discussion, Comm. Shafer moved, seconded by Comm. Sandlin to approve the 2012-13 Election budget as recommended by the County Mayor totaling \$948,099.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

PLANNING & ENGINEERING:

Mr. Doug Demosi, Planning Director, and Mr. Delwyn Corbitt, County Engineer, were present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 Planning Department budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$751,556.

Mayor Burgess advised that the budget reflected nominal changes.

Mr. Demosi stated that he had no additional comments and he accepted the mayor's recommendation.

Comm. Jordan moved, seconded by Comm. Jernigan to approve the 2012-13 Planning and Engineering budget totaling \$751,556 as recommended by the County Mayor.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

STORM WATER MANAGEMENT:

The mayor's recommendation for the 2012-13 Storm Water budget totaled \$158,655. Mr. Burgess advised that Account 57800-103, Assistants, reflected the largest increase because the individual in the position had passed the professional engineering exam.

Comm. Jernigan moved, seconded by Comm. Peay to approve the 2012-13 Storm Water Management budget as recommended by the County Mayor totaling \$158,655.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

ENVIRONMENTAL:

The mayor's recommendation for the 2012-13 Environmental budget totaled \$600. The budget reflected funding to cover the telephones for the state office that was leased from the county for issuing septic permits.

Comm. Sandlin moved, seconded by Comm. Peay to approve the 2012-13 Environmental budget totaling \$600 as recommended by the County Mayor.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

COUNTY BUILDINGS:

Mr. Ben Mankin, County Maintenance Director, was present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 County Buildings budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$1,849,143.

Mayor Burgess explained the increases and decreases to the budget from the prior year. The budget reflected a decrease from the prior year of \$58,567.

Mr. Mankin advised that he accepted the mayor's recommendation.

Comm. Sandlin moved, seconded by Comm. Jernigan to approve the 2012-13 County Buildings budget totaling \$1,849,143 as recommended by the County Mayor.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

ARCHIVES:

Mr. John Lodl, County Archives Director, was present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 Archives budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$194,656, which was a reduction of \$20,687 from the prior year.

Mr. Lodl advised that he accepted the mayor's recommendation.

Comm. Jordan moved, seconded by Comm. Sandlin to approve the 2012-13 Archives budget totaling \$194,656 as recommended by the County Mayor.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

RISK MANAGEMENT:

Mrs. Melissa Stinson, Risk Management Director, was present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 Risk Management budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$1,119,049.

The Finance Director advised that based upon Janet Bowman's presentation at the May 10 Budget Committee meeting, Account 101-51920-502, Building and Contents Insurance, could be revised from \$91,350 to \$96,000; and Account 51920-506, Liability Insurance, could be revised from \$461,685 to \$445,000. The revised recommendation for the Risk Management Department totaled \$1,107,014.

Mrs. Stinson brought the committee's attention to Account 51920-508, Premiums on Corporate Surety Bonds. She explained that currently a \$50,000 bond was carried on the Director of Schools. She advised that she had begun the bond process for Mr. Odom, and in talking with the Comptroller's Office had learned that when the superintendent's position was moved from an elected position to an appointed position, the county was no longer statutorily required to carry the \$50,000 bond. The county currently carries a \$500,000 policy for employee dishonesty. The current premium on the \$50,000 bond for Mr. Gill was \$442. She advised that the county could save \$442 if the commissioners were comfortable with carrying only the \$500,000 policy as the director of schools was seen as a public employee. Mrs. Stinson advised that she did confirm this information with Ms. Bowman.

Comm. Sandlin moved, seconded by Comm. Peay to approve the 2012-13 Risk Management budget totaling \$1,107,014 as revised.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

FINANCE:

The County Mayor's recommendation for the 2012-13 Finance Department budget totaled \$1,047,472. Mayor Burgess advised that most of the increase related to the valuation process of employees. Account 52100-310, Contracts with Public Agencies, budgeted at \$6,000 provided funding for an intern through CTAS.

The Finance Director advised that she accepted the mayor's recommendation.

Comm. Jordan moved, seconded by Comm. Jernigan to approve the 2012-13 Finance Department budget totaling \$1,047,472 as recommended by the County Mayor.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

COUNTY TRUSTEE:

Mr. Teb Batey, Trustee, was present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 Trustee budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$623,950, the same as the prior year.

Mr. Batey advised that he agreed with the mayor's recommendation.

Comm. Jernigan moved, seconded by Comm. Peay to approve the 2012-13 County Trustee budget totaling \$623,950 as recommended by the County Mayor.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

COUNTY CLERK:

Mrs. Lisa Crowell, County Clerk, was present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 County Clerk budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$2,208,083.

Mayor Burgess advised that Account 52500-106, Deputies, reflected moving one part time employee to full time status. Account 52500-399, Other Contracted Services, budgeted at \$9,300 was a new line item to provide funding for microfilming records. This line item will be offset by revenue from the Archives and Records Management fee.

Mrs. Crowell advised that she accepted the mayor's recommendation.

Comm. Jernigan moved, seconded by Comm. Sandlin to approve the 2012-13 County Clerk budget totaling \$2,208,083 as recommended by the County Mayor.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

BUILDING CODES:

Mr. David Jones, Building Codes Director, was present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 Building Codes budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$786,328.

Mayor Burgess advised that the increase was due largely to the employee valuations.

Mr. Jones advised that the budget was mostly comprised of salaries and benefits, and the operating costs were only approximately \$45,000. He advised that he accepted the mayor's recommendation.

Comm. Jordan moved, seconded by Comm. Peay to approve the 2012-13 Building Codes budget totaling \$786,328 as recommended by the County Mayor.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

CHANCERY COURT:

Mr. John Bratcher, Clerk & Master, was present to answer questions regarding the 2012-13 Chancery Court budget. The mayor's recommendation totaled \$880,080.

The budget included the cost of the pay plan due to the re-valuations of the employees. It also included funding for one copy machine.

Mr. Bratcher advised that he accepted the mayor's recommendation.

Comm. Jernigan moved, seconded by Comm. Peay to approve the 2012-13 Chancery Court budget as recommended by the County Mayor totaling \$880,080.

The motion passed unanimously by acclamation.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairman Ealy reminded the committee that they would continue the review of the 2012-13 General Fund budget on May 16, 2012 at 5:30 P.M., and the committee would also meet on Monday, May 21 at 5:30 P.M. The joint meeting with the Health & Education Committee would be held on Tuesday, May 22 at 5:00 P.M. at the School Board Central Office.

There being no further business to be presented at this time, Chairman Ealy declared the meeting adjourned at 7:19 P.M.

Elaine Short, Secretary